



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/623,575	01/24/2001	Kenichi Ohmae	400830	5222

23548 7590 03/27/2006  
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD  
700 THIRTEENTH ST. NW  
SUITE 300  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3960

EXAMINER

MANNING, JOHN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/623,575

Applicant(s)

OHMAE ET AL.

Examiner

John Manning

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29 and 31-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29 and 31-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed January 4, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant fails to adequately traverse the Official Notices relied upon in the previous Office Action mailed June 2, 2005. To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating **why** the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b). See also *Chevenard*, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). It is noted that the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Lemelson discloses an interactive educational system where a student's participation may be verified and the student's progress may be tracked. As best understood by the Examiner, Applicant argues that Lemelson fails to disclose supplying a viewing code that is identical to the presented viewing code. The previous Office

Art Unit: 2614

Action does not rely upon Lemelson to teach this feature. Applicant argues that Vogel fails to disclose supplying a viewing code that is identical to the presented viewing code. The previous Office Action does not rely upon Vogel to teach this feature. In response to applicant's argument that Von Kohorn is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Von Kohorn discloses an interactive television broadcast system (Col 3, Lines 32-38 and 53-59). The disclosed generating unit 14 is an element in the disclosed interactive system. It is the Examiners position that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the advantage of using identical verification code (the codes presented to the user and subsequently entered by the user) in order to prevent cheating in the education system taught by Lemelson (see Col 5, Lines 52-67; Col 6, lines 1-4; Col 6, Lines 23-45 of Von Kohorn).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2614

3. Claims 29, 31-36 and 38-69 are met rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemelson et al. (US Pat No 5,823,788) in view of Vogel (US Pat No 5,543,015) and further in view of Van Kohorn (US Pat No 5,249,044).

Lemelson discloses an interactive educational system where a student's participation may be verified and the student's progress may be tracked.

In regard to claims 29 and 33, the claimed limitation of "entry means through which a viewer of an audiovisual program enters a confirmation code to the audiovisual program, each time a viewing confirmation code is presented to the viewer" and "the viewing confirmation code entered being transmitted to a principal who authenticates viewing of the audiovisual program" is met by Figures 1-2. "After the student inputs a response or a series of responses and enables the input device 13(s) to transmit it to the base station 11, the microprocessor 30 transmits to the base station 11 both response indicia representative of the response (which may be the response itself and/or a code identifying the response) and the identifier code provided by the identifier memory 32, so that the base station 11 can associate the response indicia to the particular student (or to the input device 13(s), which, in turn, is assigned to the student) and thereby disambiguate response indicia provided by each student" (Col 5, Lines 66-67; Col 6, Lines 1-10). Where the principal is the operator of the base station 11. The claimed limitation of "the confirmation viewing code being presented by a program-providing principle at a time specific to the audiovisual program" is met by Figure 8. "Returning to step 434, if the microprocessor 40 determines in that step that the message pertains to setting response timer parameters, it sequences to step 442, in

Art Unit: 2614

which a response timer (not shown) is set to control, for example, the allowed time for particular student(s) or all students to respond to particular question(s) or all questions” (Col 13, Lines 47-52). The user presents the response to a particular program, which is represented by a code. The claimed limitation of “transmitting means for transmitting to the principal who authenticates viewing of the audiovisual program the viewing confirmation code entered and time information corresponding to the viewing confirmation code” is met by Figures 3 and 7. The “microprocessor 40 determines in step 391 that the output message buffer enabled flag is clear, indicating that the message buffer does not contain a previous unacknowledged message, it loads the information into the output buffer and adds time and identifier codes obtained from the identifier store 32 (step 393) and sets the output message buffer enabled flag (step 395). Thereafter, the transceiver 33 can transmit the message to the base station, and the microprocessor 40 will return to step 375 to await new input” (Col 11, Lines 19-28). Lemelson fails to disclose a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program. Van Kohorn teaches a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program so as to act as a safeguard against cheating (See Col 5-6, Lines 52-4; Col 6, Lines 23-45; Col 6, Lines 23-45). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lemelson with a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program for the stated advantage. The combined teaching fails to explicitly disclose, “for comparing the time information with the time specific to the respective audiovisual

program.” The Vogel reference teaches “for comparing the time information with the time specific to the respective audiovisual program” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating (Col 8, Lines 5-40; Col 11, Lines 10-21). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined teaching with “for comparing the time information with the time specific to the respective audiovisual program” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating.

In regard to claim 31, the claimed limitation that the “entry means includes an input interface of a computer, and the time information corresponding to the viewing confirmation code is obtained from a clock function of the computer” is met by Figures 3 and 4. The input interface is met by the student keypad 23 of Figure 3. If “the microprocessor 40 determines in step 391 that the output message buffer enabled flag is clear, indicating that the message buffer does not contain a previous unacknowledged message, it loads the information into the output buffer and adds time and identifier codes obtained from the identifier store 32 (step 393) and sets the output message buffer enabled flag (step 395). Thereafter, the transceiver 33 can transmit the message to the base station, and the microprocessor 40 will return to step 375 to await new input” (Col 11, Lines 19-28). The clock function of the computer is met by the time code generator 39 of Figure 4.

In regard to claim 32, the combined teaching discloses an interactive education system and method. The reference discloses the transmission of audiovisual programs over a network. “The instructor is provided with a computer- or microprocessor-

Art Unit: 2614

controlled base station, and each student is provided with an electronic communicator as an input device which is linked to the base computer by a communication network or link such as one employing one or more wires, optical fibers, radio links, infrared links, LANs (local area networks), WANs (wide area networks) or the like" (Col 1, Lines 41-48). The reference fails to explicitly disclose that the audiovisual program is a broadcast program. However, the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that it is notoriously well known in the art to transmit an audiovisual program as a broadcast program so as to utilize the far-reaching infrastructure of the broadcast system. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement combined teaching with transmitting an audiovisual program as a broadcast program so as to utilize the far-reaching infrastructure of the broadcast system.

In regard to claim 34, the claimed limitation that "the transmission by the transmitting means is made through a computer-readable medium" is met by Figure 1. "The instructor is provided with a computer- or microprocessor-controlled base station, and each student is provided with an electronic communicator as an input device which is linked to the base computer by a communication network or link such as one employing one or more wires, optical fibers, radio links, infrared links, LANs (local area networks), WANs (wide area networks) or the like" (Col 1, Lines 41-48).

In regard to claim 35, the Lemelson reference discloses an interactive education system and method. The reference fails to explicitly disclose that the confirmation code is transmitted at any time. However, the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that it is notoriously well known in the art to transmit information at any time so as to reduce the



Art Unit: 2614

burden on the network. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Lemelson with the confirmation code is transmitted at any time so as to reduce the burden on the network.

In regard to claim 36, the claimed limitation that “the audiovisual program is provided through a reproducible medium” is met by Figure 3. “The program/data memory 31 stores a program and provides additional storage space (such as RAM storage) for holding data to be used in connection with the program, such as storing student responses prior to transmission to the base station 11” (Col 5, Lines 59-63). Where the RAM storage is a reproducible medium.

In regard to claim 37, the combined teaching reference discloses an interactive education system and method. The reference fails to explicitly disclose if reproduction of the reproducible medium is interrupted temporarily, the transmitting means transmits a medium interruption code. However, the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that it is notoriously well known in the art to send feedback indicating an error in transmission so as to notify the send of a problem. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the combined teaching with feedback indicating an error in transmission so as to notify the send of a problem.

In regard to claim 38, the claimed limitation of “code presenting means for presenting a viewing confirmation code specific to a respective audiovisual program” is met by Figure 8. “Returning to step 434, if the microprocessor 40 determines in that step that the message pertains to setting response timer parameters, it sequences to step 442, in which a response timer (not shown) is set to control, for example, the

Art Unit: 2614

allowed time for particular student(s) or all students to respond to particular question(s) or all questions" (Col 13, Lines 47-52). The user presents the response to a particular program, which is represented by a code. The input device of the disclosed system meets the code presenting means, because the user uses the input device to present the response to the system.

In regard to claim 39, the claimed limitation of "means for calculating an entry time interval of the viewing confirmation code from the entry time point transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 29" is met by Figures 3 and 4. "Returning to step 434, if the microprocessor 40 determines in that step that the message pertains to setting response timer parameters, it sequences to step 442, in which a response timer (not shown) is set to control, for example, the allowed time for particular student(s) or all students to respond to particular question(s) or all questions" (Col 13, Lines 47-52).

Also, the "microprocessor 40 determines in step 391 that the output message buffer enabled flag is clear, indicating that the message buffer does not contain a previous unacknowledged message, it loads the information into the output buffer and adds time and identifier codes obtained from the identifier store 32 (step 393) and sets the output message buffer enabled flag (step 395). Thereafter, the transceiver 33 can transmit the message to the base station, and the microprocessor 40 will return to step 375 to await new input" (Col 11, Lines 19-28). The reference fails to explicitly disclose "means for comparing the entry time interval calculated by the means" or "means for determining that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the presentation interval, within a range". The Vogel reference teaches

“means for comparing the entry time interval calculated by the means” and “means for determining that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the presentation interval, within a range” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating (Col 8, Lines 5-40; Col 11, Lines 10-21). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lemelson with “means for comparing the entry time interval calculated by the means” and “means for determining that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the presentation interval, within a range” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating.

In regard to claim 40, the Lemelson reference discloses an interactive education system and method. The reference fails to explicitly disclose “means for comparing an entry time point of a viewing confirmation code transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 29, with an elapsed time from a base time, of the viewing confirmation code presented on the audiovisual terminal” or “means for determining, from the means for comparing, that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if an entry time point is in agreement with the elapsed time, within a range”. The Vogel reference teaches “means for comparing the entry time interval calculated by the means” or “means for determining that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the presentation interval, within a range” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating (Col 8, Lines 5-40; Col 11, Lines 10-21). Consequently, it

Art Unit: 2614

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lemelson with “means for comparing the entry time interval calculated by the means” and “means for determining that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the presentation interval, within a range” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating.

In regard to claim 41, the claimed limitation of “a program viewing result file for storing a viewing confirmation code transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 29” is met by Figure 1. “By transmitting both the station identifier as well as the student's response to the base station 11, the base station 11 can generate response statistics not only for the class as a whole, but also for individual students in the class, so that base station 11 can provide information as to the individual student's progress in the class to the instructor” (Col 4, Lines 16-22). The reference fails to explicitly disclose that the “viewing confirmation code” or the student responses are stored in a file.

However, the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that it is notoriously well known in the art to store information in the form of a file so as to recall the data at a later time.

Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the combined teaching with storing the “viewing confirmation code” or the student responses as a file so as to recall the data at a later time. It is implied that there is a program authentication pattern storage means in order to compare the program authentication pattern with the “viewing confirmation code” or the student responses so as to determine if the “viewing confirmation code” or the student responses are correct.

In regard to claim 42, the Lemelson reference discloses an interactive education system and method. The reference fails to explicitly disclose “means for comparing the entry time interval transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 29, with a presentation interval of the viewing confirmation code presented on the audiovisual terminal” or “means for determining, from the means for comparing, that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the presentation interval, within a range”. The Vogel reference teaches “means for comparing the entry time interval transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 29, with a presentation interval of the viewing confirmation code presented on the audiovisual terminal” and “means for determining, from the means for comparing, that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the presentation interval, within a range” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating (Col 8, Lines 5-40; Col 11, Lines 10-21). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lemelson with “means for comparing the entry time interval transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 29, with a presentation interval of the viewing confirmation code presented on the audiovisual terminal” and “means for determining, from the means for comparing, that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the presentation interval, within a range” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating.

In regard to claim 43, the claimed limitation of “entry means through which a viewer of an audiovisual program enters a confirmation code to the audiovisual program, each time a viewing confirmation code is presented to the viewer” and “the viewing confirmation code entered being transmitted to a principal who authenticates viewing of the audiovisual program” is met by Figures 1-2. “After the student inputs a response or a series of responses and enables the input device 13(s) to transmit it to the base station 11, the microprocessor 30 transmits to the base station 11 both response indicia representative of the response (which may be the response itself and/or a code identifying the response) and the identifier code provided by the identifier memory 32, so that the base station 11 can associate the response indicia to the particular student (or to the input device 13(s), which, in turn, is assigned to the student) and thereby disambiguate response indicia provided by each student” (Col 5, Lines 66-67; Col 6, Lines 1-10). Where the principal is the operator of the base station 11. The claimed limitation of “the confirmation viewing code being presented by a program-providing principle at a time specific to the audiovisual program” is met by Figure 8. “Returning to step 434, if the microprocessor 40 determines in that step that the message pertains to setting response timer parameters, it sequences to step 442, in which a response timer (not shown) is set to control, for example, the allowed time for particular student(s) or all students to respond to particular question(s) or all questions” (Col 13, Lines 47-52). The user presents the response to a particular program, which is represented by a code. The claimed limitation of “means for storing the viewing confirmation code entered and time information corresponding presentation and entry of

Art Unit: 2614

the viewing confirmation code” is met by Figure 3. “The program/data memory 31 stores a program and provides additional storage space (such as RAM storage) for holding data to be used in connection with the program, such as storing student responses prior to transmission to the base station 11” (Col 5, Lines 59-63). The claimed limitation of “means for transmitting, after ending of the audiovisual program, from the means of storing, the viewing confirmation code and the time information from the means for storing and corresponding to the viewing confirmation code, to the principal” is met by Figures 3 and 7. The “microprocessor 40 determines in step 391 that the output message buffer enabled flag is clear, indicating that the message buffer does not contain a previous unacknowledged message, it loads the information into the output buffer and adds time and identifier codes obtained from the identifier store 32 (step 393) and sets the output message buffer enabled flag (step 395). Thereafter, the transceiver 33 can transmit the message to the base station, and the microprocessor 40 will return to step 375 to await new input” (Col 11, Lines 19-28). Lemelson fails to disclose a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program. Van Kohorn teaches a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program so as to act as a safeguard against cheating (See Col 5-6, Lines 52-4; Col 6, Lines 23-45; Col 6, Lines 23-45). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lemelson with a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program for the stated advantage. The combined teaching fails to explicitly disclose, “for comparing

Art Unit: 2614

the time information with the time specific to the respective audiovisual program.” The Vogel reference teaches “for comparing the time information with the time specific to the respective audiovisual program” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating (Col 8, Lines 5-40; Col 11, Lines 10-21). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined teaching with “for comparing the time information with the time specific to the respective audiovisual program” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating.

In regard to claim 44, the claimed limitation of “code presenting means for presenting a viewing confirmation code specific to a respective audiovisual program” is met by Figure 8. “Returning to step 434, if the microprocessor 40 determines in that step that the message pertains to setting response timer parameters, it sequences to step 442, in which a response timer (not shown) is set to control, for example, the allowed time for particular student(s) or all students to respond to particular question(s) or all questions” (Col 13, Lines 47-52). The user presents the response to a particular program, which is represented by a code. The input device of the disclosed system meets the code presenting means, because the user uses the input device to present the response to the system.

In regard to claim 45, the claimed limitation of “means for calculating an entry time interval of the viewing confirmation code from the entry time point transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 29” is met by Figures 3 and 4. “Returning to step 434, if the microprocessor 40 determines in that step that the message pertains to



Art Unit: 2614

setting response timer parameters, it sequences to step 442, in which a response timer (not shown) is set to control, for example, the allowed time for particular student(s) or all students to respond to particular question(s) or all questions” (Col 13, Lines 47-52).

Also, the “microprocessor 40 determines in step 391 that the output message buffer enabled flag is clear, indicating that the message buffer does not contain a previous unacknowledged message, it loads the information into the output buffer and adds time and identifier codes obtained from the identifier store 32 (step 393) and sets the output message buffer enabled flag (step 395). Thereafter, the transceiver 33 can transmit the message to the base station, and the microprocessor 40 will return to step 375 to await new input” (Col 11, Lines 19-28). The reference fails to explicitly disclose “means for comparing the entry time interval calculated by the means” or “means for determining that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the presentation interval, within a range”. The Vogel reference teaches “means for comparing the entry time interval calculated by the means” or “means for determining that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the presentation interval, within a range” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating (Col 8, Lines 5-40; Col 11, Lines 10-21). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lemelson with “means for comparing the entry time interval calculated by the means” and “means for determining that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the

Art Unit: 2614

presentation interval, within a range” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating.

In regard to claim 46, the claimed limitation of “means for determining scores based on a comparison carried out by the means for comparing” is met by Figure 4. “The base station 11 also includes several response score computer elements 52 through 54 for generating individual response information and class response statistics for the students in response to questions presented by the instructor. In particular, the base station 11 includes a student score generation element 52 including a student score computer 55 and a private memory 56 that stores individual responses from the students and for use by the student score computer in generating scoring information for the instructor” (Col 6, Lines 66-67; Col 7, Lines 1-7).

In regard to claim 47, the Lemelson reference discloses an interactive education system and method. The reference fails to explicitly disclose “means for comparing an entry time point of a viewing confirmation code transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 43, with an elapsed time from a base time, of the viewing confirmation code presented on the audiovisual terminal” or “means for determining, from the means for comparing, that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if an entry time point is in agreement with the elapsed time, within a range”. The Vogel reference teaches “means for comparing an entry time point of a viewing confirmation code transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 43, with an elapsed time from a base time, of the viewing confirmation code presented on the audiovisual terminal” and “means for determining, from the means for comparing, that

Art Unit: 2614

the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if an entry time point is in agreement with the elapsed time, within a range" so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating (Col 8, Lines 5-40; Col 11, Lines 10-21). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lemelson with "means for comparing an entry time point of a viewing confirmation code transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 43, with an elapsed time from a base time, of the viewing confirmation code presented on the audiovisual terminal" and "means for determining, from the means for comparing, that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if an entry time point is in agreement with the elapsed time, within a range" so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating.

In regard to claim 48, the claimed limitation of "a program viewing result file for storing a viewing confirmation code transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 43" is met by Figure 1. "By transmitting both the station identifier as well as the student's response to the base station 11, the base station 11 can generate response statistics not only for the class as a whole, but also for individual students in the class, so that base station 11 can provide information as to the individual student's progress in the class to the instructor" (Col 4, Lines 16-22). The combined teaching fails to explicitly disclose that the "viewing confirmation code" or the student responses are stored in a file. However, the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that it is notoriously well known in the art to store information in the form of a file so as to recall the data at a later time. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement

Art Unit: 2614

the combined teaching with storing the “viewing confirmation code” or the student responses as a file so as to recall the data at a later time. It is implied that there is program authentication pattern storage means in order to compare the program authentication pattern with the “viewing confirmation code” or the student responses so as to determine if the “viewing confirmation code” or the student responses are correct.

In regard to claim 49, the Lemelson reference discloses an interactive education system and method. The reference fails to explicitly disclose “means for comparing the entry time interval transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 43, with a presentation interval of the viewing confirmation code presented on the audiovisual terminal” or “means for determining, from the means for comparing, that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the presentation interval, within a range”. The Vogel reference teaches “means for comparing the entry time interval transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 29, with a presentation interval of the viewing confirmation code presented on the audiovisual terminal” and “means for determining, from the means for comparing, that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the presentation interval, within a range” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating (Col 8, Lines 5-40; Col 11, Lines 10-21). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lemelson with “means for comparing the entry time interval transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 29, with a presentation interval of the viewing confirmation code presented on the audiovisual terminal” and

“means for determining, from the means for comparing, that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the presentation interval, within a range” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating.

Claims 50 and 65-67 are met by that discussed above for claims 29 and 43.

In regard to claim 51, the claimed limitation of “providing an audiovisual program” is met by Figure 1-3. The claimed limitation “presenting a viewing confirmation code for the audiovisual program to a viewer of the audiovisual program, the viewing confirmation code being presented at a time specific to the audiovisual program” is met by Figures 3 and 4. The Lemelson reference presents a question indicative of the “viewing confirmation code” which is specific to the program watched. The claimed limitation of “receiving from the audiovisual terminal a transmission with respect to the viewing confirmation code entered and time information corresponding to the viewing confirmation code entered” is met by Figure 4. “After the student inputs a response or a series of responses and enables the input device 13(s) to transmit it to the base station 11, the microprocessor 30 transmits to the base station 11 both response indicia representative of the response (which may be the response itself and/or a code identifying the response) and the identifier code provided by the identifier memory 32, so that the base station 11 can associate the response indicia to the particular student (or to the input device 13(s), which, in turn, is assigned to the student) and thereby disambiguate response indicia provided by each student” (Col 5, Lines 66-67; Col 6, Lines 1-10). Lemelson fails to disclose a viewing code that is identical to the viewing

Art Unit: 2614

code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program. Van Kohorn teaches a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program so as to act as a safeguard against cheating (See Col 5-6, Lines 52-4; Col 6, Lines 23-45; Col 6, Lines 23-45).

Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lemelson with a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program for the stated advantage. The combined teaching fails to explicitly disclose, "determining whether the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program based upon the viewing confirmation code received and the time information." The Vogel reference teaches "determining whether the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program based upon the viewing confirmation code received and the time information" so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating (Col 8, Lines 5-40; Col 11, Lines 10-21). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined teaching with "determining whether the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program based upon the viewing confirmation code received and the time information" so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating.

In regard to claim 52, the claimed limitation of "audiovisual programs for education are provided to learners" is met by Figure 1. The claimed limitation "viewing by the learners is authenticated with the viewing authentication method as recited in claim 51" is met by Figures 1-2. "After the student inputs a response or a series of

responses and enables the input device 13(s) to transmit it to the base station 11, the microprocessor 30 transmits to the base station 11 both response indicia representative of the response (which may be the response itself and/or a code identifying the response) and the identifier code provided by the identifier memory 32, so that the base station 11 can associate the response indicia to the particular student (or to the input device 13(s), which, in turn, is assigned to the student) and thereby disambiguate response indicia provided by each student" (Col 5, Lines 66-67; Col 6, Lines 1-10).

In regard to claim 53, the claimed limitation of "providing an audiovisual program" is met by Figure 1-3. The claimed limitations "presenting a viewing confirmation code for the audiovisual program to a viewer of the audiovisual program, the viewing confirmation code being presented at a time specific to the audiovisual program" and "the viewing confirmation code entered and time information corresponding thereto are stored in an audiovisual terminal" are met by Figures 3 and 4. The Lemelson reference presents a question indicative of the "viewing confirmation code" which is specific to the program watched. The "microprocessor 40 determines in step 391 that the output message buffer enabled flag is clear, indicating that the message buffer does not contain a previous unacknowledged message, it loads the information into the output buffer and adds time and identifier codes obtained from the identifier store 32 (step 393) and sets the output message buffer enabled flag (step 395). Thereafter, the transceiver 33 can transmit the message to the base station, and the microprocessor 40 will return to step 375 to await new input" (Col 11, Lines 19-28). The claimed limitation of "receiving the viewing confirmation code stored and the time information corresponding

Art Unit: 2614

thereto transmitted from the audiovisual terminal after ending of the audiovisual program” is met by Figure 4. “After the student inputs a response or a series of responses and enables the input device 13(s) to transmit it to the base station 11, the microprocessor 30 transmits to the base station 11 both response indicia representative of the response (which may be the response itself and/or a code identifying the response) and the identifier code provided by the identifier memory 32, so that the base station 11 can associate the response indicia to the particular student (or to the input device 13(s), which, in turn, is assigned to the student) and thereby disambiguate response indicia provided by each student” (Col 5, Lines 66-67; Col 6, Lines 1-10).

Lemelson fails to disclose a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program. Van Kohorn teaches a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program so as to act as a safeguard against cheating (See Col 5-6, Lines 52-4; Col 6, Lines 23-45; Col 6, Lines 23-45). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lemelson with a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program for the stated advantage. The combined teaching fails to explicitly disclose, “determining whether the viewer is viewing the audiovisual program based upon the viewing confirmation code received and the time information.” The Vogel reference teaches “determining whether the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program based upon the viewing confirmation code received and the time information” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against



Art Unit: 2614

cheating (Col 8, Lines 5-40; Col 11, Lines 10-21). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined teaching with “determining whether the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program based upon the viewing confirmation code received and the time information” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating.

In regard to claim 54, the claimed limitation of “audiovisual programs for education are provided to learners” is met by Figure 1. The claimed limitation “viewing by the learners is authenticated with the viewing authentication method as recited in claim 53” is met by Figures 1-2. “After the student inputs a response or a series of responses and enables the input device 13(s) to transmit it to the base station 11, the microprocessor 30 transmits to the base station 11 both response indicia representative of the response (which may be the response itself and/or a code identifying the response) and the identifier code provided by the identifier memory 32, so that the base station 11 can associate the response indicia to the particular student (or to the input device 13(s), which, in turn, is assigned to the student) and thereby disambiguate response indicia provided by each student” (Col 5, Lines 66-67; Col 6, Lines 1-10).

In regard to claim 55, the claimed limitation of “providing an audiovisual program” is met by Figure 1-3. The claimed limitations “presenting a viewing confirmation code for the audiovisual program to a viewer of the audiovisual program, the viewing confirmation code being presented at a time specific to the audiovisual program” and “the viewing confirmation code entered and time information corresponding thereto are stored in an audiovisual terminal” are met by Figures 3 and 4. The Lemelson reference

Art Unit: 2614

presents a question indicative of the “viewing confirmation code” which is specific to the program watched. The “microprocessor 40 determines in step 391 that the output message buffer enabled flag is clear, indicating that the message buffer does not contain a previous unacknowledged message, it loads the information into the output buffer and adds time and identifier codes obtained from the identifier store 32 (step 393) and sets the output message buffer enabled flag (step 395). Thereafter, the transceiver 33 can transmit the message to the base station, and the microprocessor 40 will return to step 375 to await new input” (Col 11, Lines 19-28). The claimed limitation of “receiving a transmission with respect to the viewing confirmation code entered and an entry time point of the viewing confirmation code from the audiovisual terminal” is met by Figure 4. “After the student inputs a response or a series of responses and enables the input device 13(s) to transmit it to the base station 11, the microprocessor 30 transmits to the base station 11 both response indicia representative of the response (which may be the response itself and/or a code identifying the response) and the identifier code provided by the identifier memory 32, so that the base station 11 can associate the response indicia to the particular student (or to the input device 13(s), which, in turn, is assigned to the student) and thereby disambiguate response indicia provided by each student” (Col 5, Lines 66-67; Col 6, Lines 1-10). The claimed limitation of “calculating an entry time interval of the viewing confirmation code from the entry time point transmitted from the audiovisual terminal as recited in claim 29” is met by Figures 3 and 4. “Returning to step 434, if the microprocessor 40 determines in that step that the message pertains to setting response timer parameters, it sequences to

Art Unit: 2614

step 442, in which a response timer (not shown) is set to control, for example, the allowed time for particular student(s) or all students to respond to particular question(s) or all questions" (Col 13, Lines 47-52). Also, the "microprocessor 40 determines in step 391 that the output message buffer enabled flag is clear, indicating that the message buffer does not contain a previous unacknowledged message, it loads the information into the output buffer and adds time and identifier codes obtained from the identifier store 32 (step 393) and sets the output message buffer enabled flag (step 395).

Thereafter, the transceiver 33 can transmit the message to the base station, and the microprocessor 40 will return to step 375 to await new input" (Col 11, Lines 19-28).

Lemelson fails to disclose a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program. Van Kohorn teaches a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program so as to act as a safeguard against cheating (See Col 5-6, Lines 52-4; Col 6, Lines 23-45; Col 6, Lines 23-45). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lemelson with a viewing code that is identical to the viewing code where the code is transmitted after the presentation of the program for the stated advantage. The combined teaching fails to explicitly disclose "comparing the entry time interval calculated with a presented interval of the viewing confirmation code" or "determining that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the interval of the viewing confirmation code, within a range". The Vogel reference teaches "comparing the entry time interval calculated with a presented interval of the viewing confirmation code" and

Art Unit: 2614

“determining that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the interval of the viewing confirmation code, within a range” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating (Col 8, Lines 5-40; Col 11, Lines 10-21). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined teaching with “comparing the entry time interval calculated with a presented interval of the viewing confirmation code” and “determining that the viewer is viewing a respective broadcast program if the entry time interval is in agreement with the interval of the viewing confirmation code, within a range” so as to verify that responses are recorded within a defined time window to protect against cheating.

In regard to claim 56, the claimed limitation of “audiovisual programs for education are provided to learners” is met by Figure 1. The claimed limitation “viewing by the learners is authenticated with the viewing authentication method as recited in claim 53” is met by Figures 1-2. “After the student inputs a response or a series of responses and enables the input device 13(s) to transmit it to the base station 11, the microprocessor 30 transmits to the base station 11 both response indicia representative of the response (which may be the response itself and/or a code identifying the response) and the identifier code provided by the identifier memory 32, so that the base station 11 can associate the response indicia to the particular student (or to the input device 13(s), which, in turn, is assigned to the student) and thereby disambiguate response indicia provided by each student” (Col 5, Lines 66-67; Col 6, Lines 1-10).

Claims 57, 61, 63 and 68-69 are met by that discussed above for claims 51, 53 and 55.

In regard to claim 58, the claimed limitation of “audiovisual programs for education are provided to learners” is met by Figure 1. The claimed limitation “viewing by the learners is authenticated with the viewing authentication method as recited in claim 53” is met by Figures 1-2. “After the student inputs a response or a series of responses and enables the input device 13(s) to transmit it to the base station 11, the microprocessor 30 transmits to the base station 11 both response indicia representative of the response (which may be the response itself and/or a code identifying the response) and the identifier code provided by the identifier memory 32, so that the base station 11 can associate the response indicia to the particular student (or to the input device 13(s), which, in turn, is assigned to the student) and thereby disambiguate response indicia provided by each student” (Col 5, Lines 66-67; Col 6, Lines 1-10).

In regard to claim 59, the claimed limitations are met by that discusses above for claims 51, 53 and 55. However, the combined teaching fails to explicitly disclose that the “viewing confirmation code” or the student responses are stored in a file. However, the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that it is notoriously well know in the art store information in the form of a file so as to recall the data at a later time. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the combined teaching with storing the “viewing confirmation code” or the student responses as a file so as to recall the data at a later time. It is implied that there is program authentication pattern storage means in order to compare the program authentication pattern with the

Art Unit: 2614

“viewing confirmation code” or the student responses so as to determine if the “viewing confirmation code” or the student responses are correct.

In regard to claim 60, the claimed limitation of “audiovisual programs for education are provided to learners” is met by Figure 1. The claimed limitation “viewing by the learners is authenticated with the viewing authentication method as recited in claim 53” is met by Figures 1-2. “After the student inputs a response or a series of responses and enables the input device 13(s) to transmit it to the base station 11, the microprocessor 30 transmits to the base station 11 both response indicia representative of the response (which may be the response itself and/or a code identifying the response) and the identifier code provided by the identifier memory 32, so that the base station 11 can associate the response indicia to the particular student (or to the input device 13(s), which, in turn, is assigned to the student) and thereby disambiguate response indicia provided by each student” (Col 5, Lines 66-67; Col 6, Lines 1-10).

In regard to claim 62, the claimed limitation of “audiovisual programs for education are provided to learners” is met by Figure 1. The claimed limitation “viewing by the learners is authenticated with the viewing authentication method as recited in claim 53” is met by Figures 1-2. “After the student inputs a response or a series of responses and enables the input device 13(s) to transmit it to the base station 11, the microprocessor 30 transmits to the base station 11 both response indicia representative of the response (which may be the response itself and/or a code identifying the response) and the identifier code provided by the identifier memory 32, so that the base station 11 can associate the response indicia to the particular student (or to the input

device 13(s), which, in turn, is assigned to the student) and thereby disambiguate response indicia provided by each student" (Col 5, Lines 66-67; Col 6, Lines 1-10).

In regard to claim 64, the claimed limitation of "audiovisual programs for education are provided to learners" is met by Figure 1. The claimed limitation "viewing by the learners is authenticated with the viewing authentication method as recited in claim 53" is met by Figures 1-2. "After the student inputs a response or a series of responses and enables the input device 13(s) to transmit it to the base station 11, the microprocessor 30 transmits to the base station 11 both response indicia representative of the response (which may be the response itself and/or a code identifying the response) and the identifier code provided by the identifier memory 32, so that the base station 11 can associate the response indicia to the particular student (or to the input device 13(s), which, in turn, is assigned to the student) and thereby disambiguate response indicia provided by each student" (Col 5, Lines 66-67; Col 6, Lines 1-10).

4. Claim 37 is met rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemelson et al. in view of Vogel and further in view of Van Kohorn and further in view of Bates et al. (US Pat No 6,681,396).

In regard to claim 37, the aforementioned combined teaching discloses the transmission of codes from the remote station to the base station. The combined teaching fails to disclose the generation of an interruption code. Bates teaches creating interruption information or an interruption code so as to allow the user to resume the viewing of a program (Col 5, Lines 32-61; Col 6, Lines 18-46). Consequently, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined teaching with the generation of an interruption code for the stated advantage.

### ***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Manning whose telephone number is 571-272-7352. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JM

March 17, 2006



JOHN MILLER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600